

6. Applicant has substantially amended her claims, and argument is addressed to them as amended. Claim 17 replaces claim 1 and includes matter from claim 14 which examiner said was potentially allowable. Claim 17 includes matter which was within withdrawn claim 7, namely a fold-down shelf which locks the hinged side panels in place. Please note that said fold-down shelf was also in claims 14-16.

7. As to the rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103, applicant does not believe they apply in view of the amendment of claims.

8. The claims ought to be allowable for the following reasons. Claim 17, and 15-16 ought to be allowed, inasmuch as they have subject matter which was found to comprise potentially allowable matter in the prior office action; and the re-written elements of now-cancelled claim 1 are now included with the potentially allowable matter.

Claim 19 ought to be allowable because it is the combination of wedge and pocket with the hinge which is subject matter, which is not taught. Furthermore, what applicant means and describes as wedge and pocket is not what is shown in the elements cited by examiner in the Powell patent. Applicant does not claimed to have invented the wedge and pocket; it is a purchased component.

Claim 20 ought be allowed because it is the combination of stretcher with shelf that is claimed. By definition, the stretcher of claim 20 runs only part way along the length of the article. While stretchers for preventing hinge motion may be known, so are other devices as the prior art shows. So, to find obvious the invention in the references comprises picking and choosing in hindsight.

Claim 21 ought to be allowed because there is no art which shows or suggests it.

Claim 23 is not anticipated by support plate element 68 of Margulis. The element 68 is not attached to the top, but to the back; and, it and has another function in the Margulis apparatus than stiffening.

Claim 22 and 23 at least ought to be allowed as a preferred embodiment of the patentable invention of claim 17. Similarly, notwithstanding applicant's argument, claims 18-21 ought to alternatively be allowed on such basis.

Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
DONNA CHUNG

By C. G. Nessler  
Her Attorney

C. G. Nessler  
Box H